



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,944	04/20/2001	Dong-Hoon Bae	42321/DBP/Y35	4121
23363	7590	04/28/2004	EXAMINER	
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP 350 WEST COLORADO BOULEVARD SUITE 500 PASADENA, CA 91105			GODDARD, BRIAN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2171	9
DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/839,944	BAE, DONG-HOON
Examiner	Art Unit	
Brian Goddard	2171	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 06 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1 and 3-38.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8.  The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.

9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) ( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.

10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**SAFET METJAHIC**  
 SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
 TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new issues being: The changes in dependency for claims 24-31, broadening the scope of each of these claims; and the content added in newly proposed claims 39 and 40.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.

On pages 12-13, applicant argued that May's indexing structure is strictly hierarchical, and although it may be ultimately displayed in a circular manner, there is no teaching or suggestion that the structure itself is "arranged in a substantially circular manner" as claimed. The examiner disagrees for substantially the same reasons as recited in the Final Office Action (Paper No. 7). Although May's overall indexing structure is hierarchical, each nodal level of the hierarchical index is logically structured in a circular manner. The "logical seam demarking the start and beginning of the hierarchy" that applicant refers to is a seam at the TOP or BOTTOM of the hierarchy, which is also clearly present in applicant's own invention (See Fig. 2). However, at each of the hierarchical "levels," the indexing matrix is "substantially circular" as claimed. If this were not so, the circular navigation of the index shown in May's Fig. 1 would not be possible.

On pages 13-15, applicant argued that Delano, and therefore the combination, fails to teach or suggest the arrangement according to a "weighing value" as claimed.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons: Applicant's conclusion that the weighing of subtopics in Delano must be based on their relationship to the search query is simply unfounded in Delano's disclosure. This is nothing more than an assumption on applicant's part. Delano specifically teaches that each 'subtopic' is weighted relative to other subtopics beneath (associated with) a parent topic as required by the claim.